The "not...but" (*ou...alla*) New Testament Rhetorical Pattern: Its Features and Purposes and the Dangers of Misinterpretation

By Nijay Gupta*

Introduction

The New Testament books are theological texts. Indeed, one may take Romans as a model example of a book that has shaped Christian theology in an incalculable way. Thus, Melanchthon's famous labeling of Romans as "the compendium of Christian religion." However, in recent decades, Romans has been read, not only as a coherent piece of theological reasoning, but also as a specimen of rhetoric – that is, a letter written with a particular audience in mind and with specific *rhetorical* purposes. The going assumption of most Paulinists today is that, if Pauline theology is to be appropriately defined, it must be examined historically, sociologically, and also rhetorically. The same can easily be said for the Gospels – they are certainly resources for looking at the hero of the story – Jesus of Nazareth. However, they are also pieces of *rhetoric*; it is commonplace to examine how each evangelist works with and through received Jesus traditions and also offers a unique angle on the life and death of Jesus in order to teach the intended readers something specific about him, his God, his community of followers, the world and its ways, the times, and/or salvation.[1]

When encountering the New Testament texts, modern, western, English-speaking interpreters make many presumptions about what these ancient, Greek texts are talking about and what points they are trying to communicate. This can sometimes initiate a butterfly effect, as a small grammatical or cultural misunderstanding can lead to a wrong reading of the purpose or trajectory of a rhetorical discourse, and the net result is a skewed theological conclusion in some cases.[2] One could point to, for example, the *pistis Christou* debate[3] which is a relatively recent controversy, as the subjective reading ("the faithfulness of Christ [himself]") did not receive a fair and widespread hearing until Richard Hays' appeal in the late 20th century.[4] In this

*Dr. Nijay Gupta (Ph.D., University of Durham) is Instructor of Biblical Studies at Seattle Pacific University

stakes are high, and passionate proponents on each side claim that the other group leaves something missing or enervated in Paul's theology.[5]

Our concern in this study (what we will call the "*ou...alla*" or "not...but" pattern) is similar, in that it deals with a rhetorical pattern that is very common in the New Testament and, yet, its meaning is presumed rather than rhetorically examined. When this pattern appears in places where an author is dealing with theological matters, a misreading of the purpose of the pattern can lead to misguided conclusions. My thesis will be that this pattern, due to its contrastive and symmetrical construction as well as its frequency,[6] is significant in the study of the New Testament, and that due circumspection is necessary in order to occlude the generation, defense, and perpetuation of simplistic theological viewpoints.

Description of the Pattern

The pattern itself I refer to as the "*ou...alla*" or "not...but" rhetorical pattern for the reason that its focus is on contrasting two items by way of the Greek words οὐ and ἀλλά.[7] The syntax, meaning, and purpose of the juxtaposition depends primarily on the ἀλλά.[8] On the most basic level, ἀλλά functions as an *adversative*, but S.E. Porter notes that sometimes its use approximates an *emphatic* conjunction.[9] Below we will demonstrate and expand upon these two basic syntactical uses of ἀλλά, but further the discussion with regard to the syntactical choices meant to drive the author's argument.

Note the following example:
ὁ δὲ στραφεὶς εἶπεν τῷ Πέτρῳ· ὕπαγε ὀπίσω μου, σατανᾶ· σκάνδαλον εἶ ἐμοῦ, ὅτι **οὐ** φρονεῖς τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ **ἀλλὰ** τὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων (Matt 16:23).
But he turned and said to Peter, "Get behind me, Satan! You are a stumbling block to me; for you are setting your mind **not** on divine things **but** on human things" (Matt 16:23).

The first and most obvious feature of this pattern is the appearance of οὐ and ἀλλά. More importantly, though, is the symmetry on either side of the ἀλλά - both concepts in contrast are "things," whether "of God" or "of humans." The rhetorical nature of this pattern is quite obvious – it would have been enough for the Matthean Jesus to have said, "You are setting your mind on the things of

humans" (φρονεῖς τὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων). The purpose of the addition of "οὐ...τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ" is to set the (logically) affirmative declaration in view of the (logically) negative one.
The interpretation of this statement, at least in this case, is rather obvious – *not recognizing the trajectory of Jesus' path towards suffering and contempt for the potential shame of the cross unveils Peter's worldly or fleshly perspective rather than that of God and his wise and true people*. However, let us examine another example of the pattern:

Ἰησοῦς δὲ ἔκραξεν καὶ εἶπεν· ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμὲ **οὐ** πιστεύει εἰς ἐμὲ **ἀλλὰ** εἰς τὸν πέμψαντά με (John 12:44).
Then Jesus cried aloud: "Whoever believes in me believes **not** in me **but** in him who sent me" (John 12:44).

Again, we have the same appearance of οὐ and ἀλλά in close proximity. Again, there are some affinities with the two items in contrast – both make use of εἰς and a form of με. But in the former case the relationship between the two contrasted items was clearly antithetical – *God* and *humans*. In the latter example, John 12:44, however, the level of contrast is not the same. The ostensible purpose of the statement is not to set Jesus (ἐμέ) at odds with his sender. If the statement was taken as exclusive, it would be nonsensical – "The one who believes in me does not believe in me..." It is for this reason that some translators have chosen to add "only" to the clause: "not *only* in me, but in the one who sent me" (NIV). Clearly there is a sense in which the contrast is not meant to be absolute or contradictory. It is of another kind – one of *emphasis*.
It is on the basis of such very different kinds of interpretations of these two types of occurrences of the "*ou...alla*" rhetorical pattern that I suggest two syntactical labels: the former can be called *exclusive negation*, and the latter, *contrast of significance*.[10] When encountering the former, the interpreter can, more often than not, perceive when one thing excludes the other by definition or by logic. Examples of *exclusive negation* include:
μὴ γίνου ἄπιστος ἀλλὰ πιστός ["Do not doubt but believe"] (John 20:27).

πῶς οὖν ἐλογίσθη; ἐν περιτομῇ ὄντι ἢ ἐν ἀκροβυστίᾳ; οὐκ ἐν περιτομῇ ἀλλ' ἐν ἀκροβυστίᾳ [How then was it reckoned to him? Was it before or after he had been circumcised? It was not after, but before he was circumcised] (Rom 4:10).

οὐ γάρ ἐστιν ἀκαταστασίας ὁ θεὸς ἀλλὰ εἰρήνης [For God is not of disorder but of peace] (1Cor 14:33).

The above cases can easily be categorized as *exclusive negation* because the presence of the one naturally excludes the other. The negated category is often given to draw the dividing line between two sides – belief and disbelief, circumcision and uncircumcision, confusion and peace.

Just as one can recognize *exclusive negation* in some cases quite easily, so also with *contrast of significance*. Again, note the following example. In Acts 5:4, in the story of Ananias and Sapphira, Peter questions the couple in this way: "How is it that you have contrived this deed in your heart? You did not lie to humans but to God (οὐκ ἐψεύσω ἀνθρώποις ἀλλὰ τῷ θεῷ)!" Here, of course, "humans" and "God" are contrasted, but that it cannot be an example of *exclusive negation* should be obvious – they actually *did* lie to humans. It is an example of a *contrast of significance* because the point of Peter's statement is that, though they *did* lie to humans, it is more important that they recognize their false testimony before *God*. One simple way, then, of determining an example of *contrast of significance* is to ascertain whether the negated concept is really contrary to fact or incompatible (by definition) with the paralleled item.

In Matthew's Gospel when Jesus explains that his disciples will be forcefully escorted before "governors and kings," he tells them not to worry about what they will say because

"it is not you who speak, but the Spirit of your Father speaking through you" (10:20).[11]

Clearly the disciples are, in fact, speaking. The idea, again, is one of *significance* – the disciples are to be assured that, though they will indeed need to speak, they will be inspired and should not worry ahead of time about the specific content of their apology.[12]

In some cases, deciding between the two uses of the pattern is not difficult. However, the problem with this rhetorical pattern is that, while many cases fit clearly into one category or the other, there are some cases that require more thought and reflection. Moreover, the evidence from most translations and commentaries reveals that we naturally presume *exclusive negation* because the other option is not usually readily in mind. Indeed, sometimes, when the pattern

is *misread* and the theological stakes are high, the damage can be tremendous and wide-ranging. Two case studies will reveal the theological and rhetorical significance of this pattern and the complexity of its interpretation.

Philippians 2:4

In this letter, Paul is at least partially interested in addressing the relationships of his converts in Philippi. We can infer that they were dealing with some amount of suffering at the hands of others (1:29).[13] One element of Paul's exhortation is to maintain solidarity with fellow believers (1:27). Some scholars have wondered if disunity was a serious and central problem in the church.[14] Whether or not such arguments will prove convincing, it is clear that cooperation is a *leitmotif* of the letter and that strife and quarrelling are treated as petty and self-centered vices. Just before the introduction of the so-called "Christ-hymn," Paul gives this advice:

> Do nothing from selfish ambition or conceit, but in humility regard others as better than yourselves. Let each of you look not to your own interests, but to the interests of others (Phil 2:3-4).

Here we have an excellent example of the "*ou...alla*" pattern (2:4). How, though, does one arbitrate between the two possible interpretations of this idea? If it is taken as *exclusive negation*, then other-regard is virtuous and preferred, while self-interest is shameful. If it is understood as an example of a *contrast of significance*, the point is not that self-interest is problematic, but that other-regard is to be prioritized. A key consideration is determining, according to the flow of the argumentation and an acquaintance with Paul's thought in general, whether self-interest is acceptable. Additionally, there is a text-critical dimension. Some manuscripts include a καί after the ἀλλά.

μὴ τὰ ἑαυτῶν ἕκαστος σκοποῦντες ἀλλὰ **καὶ** τὰ ἑτέρων ἕκαστοι (𝔓^{46} ℵ A B C D^{2} 0278 33 1739 1881 𝔐)

μὴ τὰ ἑαυτῶν ἕκαστος σκοποῦντες ἀλλὰ τὰ ἑτέρων ἕκαστοι (D*,^{c} F G K it)

While the Western witnesses omit this καί, there is a tendency to view the inclusion of it as most likely part of the original.[15] M. Silva interprets its omission in some manuscripts as probably accidental. However, he entertains the possibility that it was added later on by scribes who were fearful that Paul's statement was too ascetic.[16] Nevertheless, even though most interpreters accept the longer reading, the theological/rhetorical line is divided over how to interpret it. Markus Bockmuehl reads Paul's words as *exclusive negation*: "In the

absence of *monon, alla kai* properly...[means] 'but actually' or 'but rather'—not 'but also'."[17] This position appears to be strengthened by Troels Engberg-Pedersen's research on this construction,[18] however it is obviously quite difficult to decide when it means "but also" and "but rather."[19] Again, it becomes a rhetorical and theological matter.

On the other end of the spectrum, Gordon Fee seems to advocate that this is what we are calling a *contrast of significance* – self-interest is natural, but the focus here is on "the basic orientation of one's life" being self-sacrificial as evident in the example of Christ.[20] Or, as Walter Hansen puts it, "Paul does not advocate total self-neglect, but a reprioritizing of life so that *each of you* gives the largest share of attention to *others*."[21] Theologically, there is evidence for both readings offered here. Clearly it is acceptable to take heed of one's own matters from a Hebraic standpoint as in the Jewish maxim: "You shall love your neighbor as yourself" (Lev 19:18; Matt 19:19; 23:39; Mark 12:31; Luke 10:27; Rom 13:9).[22] On the other hand, Paul is insistent in 1 Corinthians 13:5 that love "does not pursue its own interests" (οὐ ζητεῖ τὰ ἑαυτῆς). We may conclude, then, that Paul does not treat self-interests and other-interests equally, but clearly prioritizes the latter. Given the presence of καί, it is almost certain that this is a case of *contrast of significance*, but the contrast may be so stark and pointed that it comes as close to *exclusive negation* as possible without supporting complete exclusion.

Ephesians 6:12

Directly after the Ephesians household code (5:21-6:9), this magisterial letter transitions to a sober exhortation for the readers to "be strong in the Lord and in the strength of his power" (6:10). They are encouraged to endow themselves with the "full armor of God" to fight the devil (6:11). What comes next is a description of the nature of the evil combatants: "For our struggle is not against enemies of blood and flesh, but against the rulers, against the authorities, against the cosmic powers of this present darkness, against the spiritual forces of evil in the heavenly places."

This verse has been traditionally read to mean that humans are not the enemies, but spiritual forces are.[23] That is, historically this has been read as an example of *exclusive negation* – there is only one type of enemy. It is not human or fleshly, but spiritual. Neil Elliott has interpreted this as proof that

Paul could not have written Ephesians because such a statement would demonstrate to the Roman Empire that there would be no Christian resistance.[24] However, what if this is a *contrast of significance*? Thus, the intention is more in terms of the relative value of the options – the enemies are not *merely* flesh and blood, but *more importantly* the rulers and powers of the heavenly realms. H. Schlier explains it this way: "Naturally, blood and flesh can be found on the front lines. But the conflict runs much deeper. The struggle is finally against a myriad of tirelessly attacking opponents, too slippery to grasp, with no specific names, only collective designations."[25] This leads believers to stand firm in light of the *magnitude* of the struggle.[26] If Ephesians 6:12 is interpreted in this way, the author is arguing, *don't act as if you are fighting merely a skin and bones enemy; step back and look at what you are up against and prepare accordingly.*

One of the critical factors in deciding between an *exclusive negation* and a *contrast of significance* is the purpose of Paul's statement. In particular, what is the nature of the "For" (ὅτι) at the beginning of the sentence? If it looks back to "devil," one could certainly infer that Paul's point is that spiritual powers are the only enemy. However, the whole tone of this passage involves encouraging the Ephesians to wake up and take their situation seriously. Again, it is an attempt to establish the gravity of the situation. Their sobriety and attentiveness needs to be all-the-more sharp because, despite what they might think, their enemies are not *merely* the human faces of opposition with which they currently contend.

Another element of the interpretation of this form of the *ou...alla* pattern is cultural – regarding how people viewed spiritual and human matters. Post-Enlightenment, we have a tendency to see this as black and white – there are physical things and spiritual things and the two realms are separate. However, according to ancient understandings of the intersection of the human and divine, "Nothing in heaven can happen without profound repercussions on earth; indeed, that is the way true change on earth is brought about."[27] Thus, the spiritual is not strictly what is "up there" while the physical is what is "down here" – for the author of Ephesians, the church is an earthly physical reality, the body of Christ (1:23), but also that entity which has been raised up and seated with Christ "in the heavenly places" (2:6).[28]

In a way, as well, arguing that conflict is never with "blood and flesh" is a bit naïve – if the author of Ephesians was not Paul, he would certainly not

have understood the apostle well if he did not acknowledge the great contest he had with many "blood and flesh" foes – indeed, Paul knew what it was to even fight wild animals *in Ephesus* (1 Cor 15:32)!

The point in Ephesians 6:12, it would seem, is that from a human perspective, inter-human conflict is there and a response is needed. The author of Ephesians is preparing his readers for the reality that puny human weapons are not enough to finally win the battle. He draws back the curtain to show the puppet masters.[29]

What the Paul of Ephesians tries to communicate in plain words can be accomplished in other ways. John Collins, in a discussion of the symbolic significance of the four "beasts" of Daniel 7, explains: "The vision of the terrible beasts rising out of the sea does not merely give factual information that four kinds or kingdoms will arise. It paints a picture of these kingdoms as monstrous eruptions of chaos, in order to convey a sense of terror far beyond anything suggested by the flat statement of interpretation. The kings are not merely human but are manifestations of the primordial force of chaos. As St. Paul might say: "our struggle is not against flesh and blood but against principalities and powers."[30] Again, the wider cultural perspective of the time accepted that human opposition was real and problematic, but casting the problem on a larger canvas of spiritual domination was a way of acknowledging the urgency and gravity of the matter. The modern tendency to turn away from one possibility ("blood and flesh") and only fixate on the spiritual powers is to choose *exclusive negation* largely on a theological and cultural presumption. This is almost certainly a case of *contrast of significance* and translations would probably do well to reflect this by adding "merely" or "only" after "not."

Reflection and Conclusion

There are numerous interesting examples that could be explored and a host of interrelated rhetorical and theological matters involved in interpretation. Suffice it to say that, as the above two cases have shown, ostensibly very simple interpretive and translational decisions can have a significant bearing upon perspectives as important as the nature of self-interest and the interaction of the human and divine. In the cases above, a host of exegetical methods, from textual criticism to literary critical issues to cultural-religious perspectives, needed to be considered to make a final judgment. However, the purpose of this

paper is to make one major point: translators and scholars too often presume *exclusive negation*. However, there are enough examples of an obvious kind of *contrast of significance* that serious consideration must be given to each instance of the pattern.

We may say, then, in terms of principles, this: First, one must consider whether the two items on either side of the adversative ἀλλά are, in fact, exclusive. If I said, it is *not* 2009, but it is 2010 – only one of these is actually possible. There are many examples of this in the NT and in everyday speech. However, so very often the *purpose* and *nature* of the rhetorical pattern makes a point other than one of "reality" – *let me tell you what is true and what is not true*. It is a matter of focus, or emphasis. If I said, "I want you not to talk, but to listen!" (in an angry tone), it is probably the case that I am most interested in you listening. If you can find a way to talk *and* listen, so be it. But the statement is contrastive to show the seriousness of the concern, not to make an equal statement both about talking and about listening. Of course there are examples where exclusivity is the point, but, again, this pattern is so highly stylized that we must be careful to read the rhetoric rightly!

In the end, the reader and translator of the New Testament need to recognize the flexibility of this pattern and the complexity of its interpretation. We must take this pattern seriously and struggle through the various options, while reflecting on the importance of context and presuppositions – that of the text, author, and original readers, and also our own.

ENDNOTES

[1] Consider the important debate about the audience(s) of the Gospels; see the recent collection of essays in E. Klink III, *The Audience of the Gospels* (London: T & T Clark, 2010).

[2] Indeed, D.A. Campbell offers just such a concern, in an intensified discussion, in his recent *Deliverance of God* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2009).

[3] This debate involves the matter of how to best translate and interpret the Greek phrase *pistis Christou* – as "faith *in* Christ" or the "faith of [i.e. demonstrated by] Christ."

[4] R.B. Hays, *The Faith of Jesus Christ* (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983).

[5] See, most recently, the state of the debate and arguments from both sides in M.F. Bird and P. Sprinkle, *The Faith of Jesus Christ: Exegetical, Biblical, and Theological Studies* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2009).

[6] I have detected almost a hundred occurrences of this pattern in the New Testament.

[7] In a small percentage of the occurrences of this pattern, μή appears instead of οὐ due to the grammatical mood of the verb to which the negative particle is being applied.

[8] Blass and Thackeray helpfully address the importance of paying attention to conjunctions in translation and interpretation as they serve the purpose of "express[ing] the mutual relations existing between the sentences and the clauses which compose them: membership of a single series, antithesis, relation between cause and effect, or between condition and result"; see F. Blass and H. St J Thackeray, *Grammar of the New Testament Greek* (London: Macmillan, 1898), p 259.

[9] The example he offers is John 8:26; see *Idioms of the Green New Testament* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 205-6. Richard Young works out the use of ἀλλά in more detail, referring to four options: contrast, emphasis, exclusion, and transition. While this taxonomy is helpful, we will continue to work with two main options from a *rhetorical* perspective. See further R. Young, *Intermediate New Testament Greek: A Linguistic and Exegetical Approach* (Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman, 1994), particularly 180.

[10] Grammarians have differentiated between these two kinds of negations, but do not address the rhetorical and/or theological implications of the use of such particles. BDF does offer a short treatment under "Particles and Conjunctions" in §448. Vis-à-vis what I will refer to as a *contrast of significance* BDF explains in this way: "οὐ...ἀλλά also means 'not so much...as' in which the first element is not entirely negated, but only toned down." Note also that BDF points to an article by A. Kuschke who makes mention of "relative negation" (*ZNW* 43 [1950/1] 262). John Denniston, in his *The Greek Particles*, differentiates grammatically between two uses of ἀλλά. The first use he terms "eliminative," where something true is substituted for something false. Alternatively, "In a great number of passages... ἀλλά simply expresses opposition, and it is left undetermined whether the opposite ideas are, or are not, incompatible." See *The Greek Particles* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1934), 1-31, especially 1-7. While Denniston and others have observed the different syntactical uses of ἀλλά, our intention is to take the discussion further with a rhetorical analysis of the pairing of οὐ and ἀλλά as well as a consideration of how modern interpreters of the NT draw out theological inferences based on their reading of this pattern.

[11] In Greek: οὐ γὰρ ὑμεῖς ἐστε οἱ λαλοῦντες ἀλλὰ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν τὸ λαλοῦν ἐν ὑμῖν (Matt 10:20).

[12] One may say that here, despite the rhetorical quality of the text, Matthew may intend to mean that the Spirit will miraculously speak for them without the use of their own body parts. However, in the preceding verse, it is clear that they will be doing the speaking, though the content of the speech will be "given" to them (Matt 10:19).

[13] See L. Ann Jervis, *At the Heart of the Gospel* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2007).
[14] See D. Peterlin, *Paul's Letter to the Philippians in the Light of Disunity in the Church* (Leiden: Brill, 1995).
[15] See translations that reflect the inclusion of this conjunction: ASV, KJV, NIV, ESV, RSV, NASB; alternatively the NRSV appears to reject this reading.
[16] See M. Silva, *Philippians* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1992), 104.
[17] M.N.A. Bockmuehl, *Paul's Letter to the Philippians* (BNTC; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson,), 113. This position also appears to be endorsed by Morna Hooker in *Philippians* (NIB; Minneapolis, MN: Abingdon, 2000), 500.
[18] Troels Engberg-Pedersen, "Radical Altruism in Philippians 2:4," in J. Fitzgerald et al. (ed.), *Early Christianity and Classical Culture: Comparative Studies in Honor of Abraham Malherbe* (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 197-204.
[19] Engberg-Pedersen lists many examples from Sophocles and Plato. Whether or not this might be the case, if we follow Paul's own use of this *"alla kai"* construction, we find that the overwhelming majority of instances refer to "and also" (Rom 1:32; 4:12, 16, 24; 5:3; 6:5; 8:23; 9:24; 16:4; 2 Cor 7:7; 8:21; 9:21; 1 Thess 1:5; 2:8; and in Philippians itself in 1:18, 29; 2:27). Certainly one must argue from each individual context, but I would suggest that there is little evidence (outside of Engberg-Pedersen's peculiar reading of Philippians) to promote this nuance of καί in his own usage. Pedersen's position, though, is not too far from the tentative conclusion to this section where, even though we endorse 2:4 as an example of *contrast of significance*, it is such a stark contrast that it comes quite close to *exclusive negation.* This would suggest a strong altruism, but perhaps not "radical."
[20] Gordon Fee, *Paul's Letter to the Philippians* (NICNT; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1995).
[21] G.W. Hansen, *The Letter to the Philippians* (PNTC; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2009), 117.
[22] J.D.G. Dunn makes the important cautionary point that, though Paul is focused on the needs of others, he probably does accept the "importance of self-respect"; see *Romans 9-16* (WBC; Dallas, TX: Nelson, 1989), 779.
[23] See E. Best, *Ephesians: A Shorter Commentary* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2003), 318.
[24] See N. Eliott, "The Apostle Paul and Empire," in R. Horsley (ed.), *In the Shadow of Empire* (Louisville, KY: WJK, 2008). 97-116.
[25] *Der Brief an die Epheser* (Dusseldorf: Patmos, 1958), 291; translated by T.Y. Neufeld, in *Put on the Armor of God* (JSNTS 140; Sheffield: Academic Press, 1997), 123.
[26] See G.K. Beale, *Revelation* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1999), 623.
[27] Walter Wink, *Engaging the Powers* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992).
[28] This point is emphatically punctuated in Neufeld, *Armor of God*, 124.

[29] Christopher Wright proposes that exactly such a view would have been commonly held by Jews who perceived that "spiritual powers and forces" have invaded and have influence "over human economic relationships, structures and ideologies" and "can wield an oppressive tyranny over humankind in this sphere, just as they hold people in the slavery of mental and spiritual darkness"; see *Old Testament Ethics for the People of God* (Downer's Grove, IL: IVP, 2004), 153.

[30] J.J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998), 101.